

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/898,555	07/02/2001	Terence Joseph Murphy	TI-33069	2709
75	90 08/19/2002			
Daniel W. Swayze Texas Instruments, Incorporated M/S 3999			EXAMINER GONZALEZ, JULIO C	
,			2834	
			DATE MAILED: 08/19/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- All			
Advisory Action	09/898,555	MURPHY, TERENCE JOSEPH				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Julio C. Gonzalez	2834				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 29 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application abandonment of the control of the	ation. A proper reply h places the application	to a on in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date			*			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	١.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The approportion of the fee. The approportion of the final O	priate extension ffice action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>05 August 2002</u> . Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			h in			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	•				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or		rially reducing or sim	plifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment			
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT	place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly			
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3 and 5-23</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examine	er.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•				

NESTOR BANIFEZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

10. Other: ____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Prior art may still be applied to the claims and claims are very unclear.